



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,354	02/26/2002	Brian Jacobsen	38627-170421	2756
26694	7590	08/23/2006	EXAMINER	
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20045-9998			ABEL JALIL, NEVEEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	
DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/082,354

Applicant(s)

JACOBSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Neveen Abel-Jalil

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 54-59 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/10/06</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6-June-2006 has been entered.

2. The amendment filed on 6-June-2006 has been received and entered. Claims 1-59 are pending, of which claims 54-59 have been withdrawn from prosecution, therefore, claims 1-53 are presented for examination.

### ***Election/Restrictions***

3. This application contains claims 54-59 drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper filed on June 28, 2005. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 1, 3, 6, 21, 25, 35, 50, and 53 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claims 1, 3, and 25, the recitation of “for indexing” in line 7, constitute Intended use and does not carry patentable weight since it never has to occur. Claims should be amended to recite more firm and positive language (i.e. “to”, “based on”, “is”, “that” or “wherein”). Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 6, 21, and 35 recite an “if” statement which suggest optionally, passive recitation. If the Applicant intended to have the remaining limitations after the “if” statement to be considered fully and given complete patentable weight. The “if” recitation should be changed to recite more firm and definite language (i.e. wherein or when). Since “if” statement is optional, the remaining limitation does not necessarily have to happen (i.e. the assignment of word score). Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 50, and 53 are directed to single means, which should be deleted. See *MPEP* 2164.08(a) Single Means Claim which states:

A single means claim, i.e., where a means recitation does not appear in combination with another recited element of means, is subject to an undue breadth rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714-715, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (A single means claim which covered every conceivable means for achieving the stated purpose was held nonenabling for the scope of the claim because the specification disclosed at most only those means known to the inventor.). When claims depend on a recited property, a fact situation comparable to Hyatt is possible, where the claim covers every conceivable structure (means) for

achieving the stated property (result) while the specification discloses at most only those known to the inventor.

In claim 6, the recitation of "enough" is a relative term. The claim should be amended to recite more definite and direct language such as "Threshold" or "limit".

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 14-23, 27, 33-37, 40-43, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gabriel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,468 B1).

As to claims 1, 40, and 41, Gabriel et al. discloses a computer-implemented method of implementing a search engine to compile and access subject-specific information from a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

traversing links between sites on the computer network, by said search engine (See Gabriel et al. column 3, 48-56, wherein "crawler" does the traversing of links, and see Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 37-43);

filtering, by said search engine, contents of each site visited to determine relevancy of content to said particular subject (See Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 64-67, and see Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 21-30); and

presenting for indexing, at said search engine, information on each site deemed relevant to said particular subject by said filtering (See Gabriel et al. column 2, lines 35-46).

As to claim 14, and 47, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein at least one of said filtering steps comprises the step of:

passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter, the filter comparing contents of the site with terminology found in the lexicon (See Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 62-67, and see Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 1-10).

As to claim 15, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter comprises the steps of:

breaking up a web page corresponding to the site contents into component parts (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63); and

comparing the contents of each component part with the lexicon (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63).

As to claims 16, and 21, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter further comprises the steps of:

assigning a weight to each component part based on a result of the step of comparing (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51); and  
deeming the component part to be relevant if it achieves a high-enough weight (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51).

As to claims 17, and 22, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of assigning a weight comprises the steps of:

assigning a weight to each word, term, or expression in the component part that matches a word, term, or expression in the lexicon, according to a weight associated with the word, term, or expression (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-56, also see Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 10-20); and

accumulating a sum of assigned weights, the sum forming the weight assigned to the component part (See Gabriel et al. column 64-67, and see Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 1-25).

As to claims 18, and 23, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter further comprises the steps of:

saving component parts deemed to be relevant to said particular subject and passing them to the presenting step (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 43-61); and

discarding component parts deemed not to be relevant to said particular subject (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51).

As to claims 9, and 19, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter further comprises the steps of:

if at least one component part is deemed to be relevant to said particular subject, passing the web page to the presenting step (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 43-61); and

if no component part is deemed to be relevant to said particular subject, discarding the web page (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51).

As to claim 20, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter comprises the step of:

comparing the contents of a web page corresponding to the site with the lexicon (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63).

As to claim 27, Gabriel et al. discloses further comprising the step of:

compiling a database of searchable relevant information (See Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 45-48, wherein “compiling” reads on “saved in a master database”).

As to claim 33, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of compiling a database comprises the step of:

for each relevant site to be stored in the database, assigning a word score to each word appearing on that site (See Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 1-20).



As to claims 34, and 36, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of assigning word scores comprises the steps of:

determining all sites found in the database that contain links to the site (See Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 43-69);

for each word on the site, assigning a word score for that word based at least in part on its presence on each site containing a link to the site (See Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 1-20).

As to claims 35, and 37, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of assigning a word score for that word further comprises the step of increasing the word score for each site containing a link to the site if the word appears in close proximity to the link (See Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 15-27).

As to claim 42, Gabriel et al. discloses further comprising the step of: monitoring a depth for each link, the depth being a reflection of relevance (See Gabriel et al. column 9, lines 1-11).

As to claim 43, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the step of monitoring comprises the steps of:

for a given site being visited, setting depths of any links leading from that site to other sites to a depth of a link traversed to reach the given site (See Gabriel et al. column 9, lines 1-11);

if the given site is determined to be relevant to said particular subject in the filtering step, setting the depths of the links leading from that site to zero (See Gabriel et al. column 9, lines 34-58); and

if the given site is determined not to be relevant to said particular subject in the filtering step, incrementing the depths of the links leading from that site (See Gabriel et al. column 10, lines 35-42).

As to claim 46, Gabriel et al. discloses a system to implement a search engine to compile and permit accessing of subject-specific information from a computer network, the system comprising:

a host computer to execute software stored upon a computer-readable storage medium to implement said search engine, the software comprising:

a smart crawler of said search engine to traverse the computer network (See Gabriel et al. column 3, 48-56, wherein “crawler” does the traversing of links, and see Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 37-43);

a first filter of said search engine, to filter out sites that are irrelevant to said particular subject, and permitting only sites relevant to said particular subject to pass (See Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 64-67, and see Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 21-30); and

an indexer of said search engine to index the relevant sites (See Gabriel et al. column 2, lines 35-46); and

memory, connected to the host computer, to store indexed subject-specific information  
(See Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 46-61).

As to claim 48, Gabriel et al. discloses wherein the system further comprises an interchangeable computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a lexicon for the lexicon-based filter, the lexicon containing terminology specific to said particular subject (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2-13, 24-25, 45, 50-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabriel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,468 B1) in view of Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,349,307 B1).

As to claims 2, 24, 49, and 51, Gabriel et al. does not teach further comprising the step of:

filtering the contents of a site at least a second time for relevancy to said particular subject, prior to the step of presenting.

Chen teaches filtering the contents of a site at least a second time for relevancy to said particular subject, prior to the step of presenting (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gabriel et al. with the teachings of Chen to include a second filtering step by a user (i.e. human) because it allows for better search results, more accurate, retrieved and customized to the user's liking (See Chen column 8, lines 36-37).

As to claims 3, 25, and 50, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein at least one of said filtering steps comprises the steps of:

presenting the contents to a human editor via a human-computer interface (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37);

approving, by the human editor, if the contents are deemed relevant to said particular subject (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37); and

disapproving, by the human editor, if the contents are not deemed relevant to said particular subject (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37),

wherein said presenting the contents, approving, and disapproving are preformed prior to said step of presenting for indexing (See Chen column 8, lines 40-50, wherein "prior to indexing" reads on "allows user to adjust" then store then or re-present them in hierarchy).

As to claim 4, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein at least one of said filtering steps comprises the step of:

passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter, the filter comparing contents of the site with terminology found in the lexicon (See Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 62-67, and see Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 1-10, also see Chen column 8, lines 33-50).

As to claim 5, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter comprises the steps of:

breaking up a web page corresponding to the site contents into component parts (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63); and

comparing the contents of each component part with the lexicon (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63).

As to claims 6, and 11, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter further comprises the steps of:

assigning a weight to each component part based on a result of the step of comparing (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51); and

deeming the component part to be relevant if it achieves a high-enough weight (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51).

As to claims 7, and 12, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of assigning a weight comprises the steps of:

assigning a weight to each word, term, or expression in the component part that matches a word, term, or expression in the lexicon, according to a weight associated with the word, term,

or expression (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-56, also see Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 10-20); and

accumulating a sum of assigned weights, the sum forming the weight assigned to the component part (See Gabriel et al. column 64-67, and see Gabriel et al. column 8, lines 1-25).

As to claims 8, and 13, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter further comprises the steps of:

saving component parts deemed to be relevant to said particular subject and passing them to the presenting step (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 43-61); and

discarding component parts deemed not to be relevant to said particular subject (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51).

As to claim 9, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter further comprises the steps of:

if at least one component part is deemed to be relevant to said particular subject, passing the web page to the presenting step (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 15-25, and see Gabriel et al. column 7, lines 43-61); and

if no component part is deemed to be relevant to said particular subject, discarding the web page (See Gabriel et al. column 6, lines 44-51).

As to claim 10, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of passing the contents of the site through a lexicon-based filter comprises the step of:

comparing the contents of a web page corresponding to the site with the lexicon (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63).

As to claims 45, and 53, Gabriel et al. does not teach wherein at least one of said filtering steps comprises the steps of:

presenting the contents to a human editor via a human-computer interface;  
approving, by the human editor, if the contents are deemed relevant to said particular subject;

disapproving, by the human editor, if the contents are not deemed relevant to said particular subject; and

wherein said presenting the contents, approving, and disapproving are preformed prior to said step of presenting for indexing.

Chen teaches wherein at least one of said filtering steps comprises the steps of:

presenting the contents to a human editor via a human-computer interface (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37);

approving, by the human editor, if the contents are deemed relevant to said particular subject (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37); and

disapproving, by the human editor, if the contents are not deemed relevant to said particular subject (See Chen column 8, lines 25-37),

wherein said presenting the contents, approving, and disapproving are preformed prior to said step of presenting for indexing (See Chen column 8, lines 40-50, wherein “prior to indexing” reads on “allows user to adjust” then store then or re-present them in hierarchy).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gabriel et al. with the teachings of Chen to include a second filtering step by a user (i.e. human) because it allows for better search results, more accurate, retrieved and customized to the user’s liking (See Chen column 8, lines 36-37).

As to claim 52, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the system further comprises an interchangeable computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a lexicon for the lexicon-based filter, the lexicon containing terminology specific to said particular subject (See Gabriel et al. column 3, lines 46-63).

9. Claims 26, 28-32, and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabriel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,584,468 B1) in view of Aridor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,848 B1).

As to claim 26, Gabriel et al. does not teach replacing the lexicon with a lexicon corresponding to a different subject in order to create a different subject-specific database.

Aridor et al. teaches replacing the lexicon with a lexicon corresponding to a different subject in order to create a different subject-specific database (See Aridor et al. column 10, lines 1-29, and also see Aridor et al. column 9, lines 42-55).



It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gabriel et al. with the teachings of Aridor et al. to include replacing the lexicon with a lexicon corresponding to a different subject in order to create a different subject-specific database because it provides for more accurate and better access to user specified search terms.

As to claim 28, Gabriel et al. does not teach further comprising the steps of:

permitting a user to enter a query; and

searching the database for information according to the query.

Although, Gabriel et al. does not explicitly teaches user query in the summary of the invention, he teaches it to be well known in the art (See Gabriel et al. column 2, lines 1-4, prior art).

Aridor et al. teaches permitting a user to enter a query (See Aridor et al. column 4, lines 11-20); and

searching the database for information according to the query (See Aridor et al. column 4, lines 11-20).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gabriel et al. with the teachings of Aridor et al. to include entering, searching, and refining searches based on a user query because it is common in the database are to retrieve and refine queries by user to gather data.

As to claims 29, and 32, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses further comprising the step of:

displaying information found in said step of searching in a hierarchical format (See Gabriel et al. Figure 5, shows ranked search results in hierarchical order, also see Aridor et al. column 11, lines 30-34).

As to claim 30, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses further comprising the step of:  
determining a site ranking for each site associated with information found in said searching step, where the determining is according to how interesting at least one of authors and users of the computer network have found the site associated with the information (See Aridor et al. column 2, lines 1-7, prior art, also see Aridor et al. column 4, lines 10-30, wherein “how interesting” reads on “user preference”).

As to claim 31, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses further comprising the step of:  
displaying the results of the user query using the site ranking of each item of information found in the search to determine an order in which the results are displayed (See Gabriel et al. Figure 5, shows ranked search results in hierarchical order, also see Aridor et al. column 11, lines 30-34).

As to claim 32, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of displaying the results of the user query comprises the step of:

displaying the results of the user query in a hierarchical format according to site ranking (See Gabriel et al. Figure 5, shows ranked search results in hierarchical order, and shows site ranking by weighted score, also see Aridor et al. column 11, lines 30-34).

As to claim 38, Gabriel et al. does not teach further comprising the steps of:  
entering a user query;  
using the user query to search the database; and  
computing a site ranking for each site associated with information found in said searching step, the site ranking being computed based on said word scores (See Aridor et al. column 11, lines 30-34).

Although, Gabriel et al. does not explicitly teaches user query in the summary of the invention, he teaches it to be well known in the art (See Gabriel et al. column 2, lines 1-4, prior art).

Aridor et al. teaches entering a user query (See Aridor et al. column 4, lines 11-20);  
using the user query to search the database (See Aridor et al. column 4, lines 11-20); and  
computing a site ranking for each site associated with information found in said searching step, the site ranking being computed based on said word scores.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Gabriel et al. with the teachings of Aridor et al. to include entering, searching, and refining searches based on a user query because it is common in the database are to retrieve and refine queries by user to gather data.

As to claim 39, Gabriel et al. as modified discloses wherein the step of computing a site ranking comprises the steps of:

for each site associated with information found in said searching step, summing the word scores for that site corresponding to words in the user query (See Aridor et al. column 11, lines 30-34).

#### *Allowable Subject Matter*

10. Claim 44 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### *Response to Arguments*

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-59 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### *Conclusion*

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-Form 892 for list of Cited References.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neveen Abel-Jalil whose telephone number is 571-272-4074.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5: 30PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Niveen Abel-Jalil', with a stylized flourish extending from the end.

Neveen Abel-Jalil  
August 21, 2006